

**Remarks**

In the final Office Action mailed June 30, 2008 claims 1-14 are pending and claims 1-14 stand finally rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1-5, 8-12, and 13. The Applicants have cancelled claims 7 and 14. The Applicants traverse the rejection herein.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No.: 2004/0252319 (Gorp). The Applicants submit that the claims are novel with respect to Gorp.

Amended independent claim 1, paraphrased herein, recites a method of reprinting at least one page of a printed document. According to the method, a print job is printed to generate a printed document. A determination is made that at least one page of the printed document includes an error. After the determination, a user is instructed to load the printed document into an inserter tray on the printer. Each page of the printed document is processed from the inserter tray to the output tray through the printer by first determining if the page includes an error. If the page being processed includes an error, the page of the printed document is discarded and reprinted from the print job to generate a new page. After reprinting, the new page is forwarded to the output tray. If the page being processed does not include an error, the page is forwarded to the output tray.

Gorp discloses a system for managing production of a document. The system includes a printing stage comprising a plurality of printers for printing portions of the document. The system also includes a finishing stage comprising one or more assembly devices for collating the document portions into a final document (Abstract). After a printer in Gorp finishes printing a portion of the document, the portion is transferred to the finishing stage for collation (Paragraph 29). Gorp discloses that if an error occurs during collation, then either an operator may be alerted of the error, or the print job may be diverted from the finishing system (Paragraph 44).

Multiple differences exist between Gorp and the method recited in claim 1. One difference is that Gorp discloses multiple separate stations used to print and collate portions of the printed document into a final document. In Gorp, for example, separate printers are used to print portions of the document and a separate collator is used to collate the portions into a final

document. In contrast, the method of claim 1 recites a user loading the printed document back on a printer for processing the document through the printer, and sending, reprinting, or discarding pages from the document based on a determination of errors in the document. The printer used to process the document may be the same printer used to initially print the document.

Another difference between Gorp and the method recited in claim 1 is that Gorp discloses that if an error occurs during collation, then either an operator may be alerted of the error or the print job may be diverted from the finishing system. In contrast, the method recited in claim 1 recites discarding the page, reprinting the page, and sending the reprinted page to the printer output tray.

The method recited in claim 1 advantageously allows a user to insert a printed document having an error into a printer, and process the document through the printer to correct the error through reprinting specific pages of the document. The Applicants submit that processing each page of the previously printed document on the printer as recited in claim 1, is neither taught nor reasonably suggested by Gorp, and therefore claim 1 is novel over Gorp for at least the reasons provided. Dependent claims 2-5 are novel for at least depending on base claim 1. Similar arguments apply to independent claim 8 and dependent claims 9-11, and 13.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorp in further view of U.S. Patent No.: 5,625,757 (Kageyama). The Applicants submit that claims 6 and 12 are non-obvious in view of the cited art for at least the reasons provided above.

#### Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-6 and 8-13 are novel and non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above. The Applicants thus respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1-6 and 8-13.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 30, 2008

/Sean J. Varley/

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397

Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP

Telephone: (303) 786-7687

Facsimile: (303) 786-7691

Customer No.: 50441